Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,430	PLOW ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179
All participants (applicant, applicant's represent	ative, PTO personnel):	· .
(1) <u>NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Janet Skafar</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 20 March 2008.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conf c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ a		ntative]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d If Yes, brief description:)∐ Yes e)⊠ No.	
Claim(s) discussed: 1.		·
Identification of prior art discussed: Graham et	<u>al</u> .	
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was	reached. g)⊠ was not reached. I	n)
reached, or any other comments: Applicant pro and pointed out how the proposed amendment discussion of the prior art rejection along with the updated search. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, allowable is available, a summary thereof must THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LASTINTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF requirements on reverse side or on attached she	might overcome the prior art relied the proposed amendments will require the amendments which the examination where no copy of the amendments be attached.) OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDITION TO THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FOR THE INTERVIEW. See Summary	ner agreed would render the claims that would render the claims that would render the claims E THE SUBSTANCE OF THE lready been filed, APPLICANT IS HIRTY DAYS FROM THIS DRM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
	. •	•
	•	